

Eastern Illinois University The Keep

Masters Theses

Student Theses & Publications

2016

Genesis B from MS Junius 11 and Paradise Lost: Possible Connections

Alicia D. Arnold

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [English](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Arnold, Alicia D., "Genesis B from MS Junius 11 and Paradise Lost: Possible Connections" (2016). *Masters Theses*. 2427.
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/2427>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

The Graduate School

EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY™



Thesis Maintenance and Reproduction Certificate

FOR: Graduate Candidates Completing Theses in Partial Fulfillment of the Degree
Graduate Faculty Advisors Directing the Theses

RE: Preservation, Reproduction, and Distribution of Thesis Research

Preserving, reproducing, and distributing thesis research is an important part of Booth Library's responsibility to provide access to scholarship. In order to further this goal, Booth Library makes all graduate theses completed as part of a degree program at Eastern Illinois University available for personal study, research, and other not-for-profit educational purposes. Under 17 U.S.C. § 108, the library may reproduce and distribute a copy without infringing on copyright; however, professional courtesy dictates that permission be requested from the author before doing so.

Your signatures affirm the following:

- The graduate candidate is the author of this thesis.
- The graduate candidate retains the copyright and intellectual property rights associated with the original research, creative activity, and intellectual or artistic content of the thesis.
- The graduate candidate certifies her/his compliance with federal copyright law (Title 17 of the U. S. Code) and her/his right to authorize reproduction and distribution of all copyrighted materials included in this thesis.
- The graduate candidate in consultation with the faculty advisor grants Booth Library the non-exclusive, perpetual right to make copies of the thesis freely and publicly available without restriction, by means of any current or successive technology, including by not limited to photocopying, microfilm, digitization, or internet.
- The graduate candidate acknowledges that by depositing her/his thesis with Booth Library, her/his work is available for viewing by the public and may be borrowed through the library's circulation and interlibrary loan departments, or accessed electronically.
- The graduate candidate waives the confidentiality provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) (20 U. S. C. § 1232g; 34 CFR Part 99) with respect to the contents of the thesis and with respect to information concerning authorship of the thesis, including name and status as a student at Eastern Illinois University.

I have conferred with my graduate faculty advisor. My signature below indicates that I have read and agree with the above statements, and hereby give my permission to allow Booth Library to reproduce and distribute my thesis. My adviser's signature indicates concurrence to reproduce and distribute the thesis.

Please submit in duplicate.

Genesis B from MS Junius 11 and Paradise Lost:

Possible Connections

(TITLE)

BY

Alicia D. Arnold

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

M.A. in English

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2016

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE





GENESIS B FROM MS *JUNIUS 11*
AND PARADISE LOST:
EXPLORING POSSIBLE
CONNECTIONS

Alicia D. Arnold



MAY 2016
EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

“When I was a child, adults would tell me not to make things up, warning me of what would happen if I did. As far as I can tell so far, it seems to involve lots of foreign travel and not having to get up too early in the morning.” — Neil Gaiman, *Smoke and Mirrors*

This work is dedicated to those that believed in me, my family by blood and by choice.

I would also like to acknowledge the hard work and dedication of Dr. Julie Campbell,

Dr. Tim Shonk, and Dr. Bailey Young.

Abstract

This thesis looks at the ongoing debate concerning John Milton's potential use of *Genesis B* from MS *Junius 11* when creating *Paradise Lost*. Much of the thesis looks at the probability of John Milton's ability to access or know *Genesis B*. Included is an annotated translation of "Satan in Hell" from *Genesis B*. The last chapter looks at the given translation and *Paradise Lost* to see if there are similarities in dialect, theme, and word-choices, or if *Paradise Lost* has Old English markers. The conclusion is that the debate must continue as there is currently not enough evidence to prove a definite connection, nor can the similarities and possibility be completely denied.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Franciscus Junius F.F. and Manuscript Circulation	9
Chapter 2: Translation of “Satan in Hell” with Notes	20
Chapter 3: Milton, His Time, and <i>Paradise Lost</i>	37

Introduction: *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost*

Genesis B forms part of a manuscript that was, until the 20th century, thought to be the work of Caedmon. The Venerable Bede (c. 672-735), in his *Ecclesiastical History of the English People* (731), notes the miracle of Caedmon learning to sing. The true miracle, however, involved this cow-herder setting a Biblical theme to old battle meter within his known poems, treating it in the style that had previously been reserved for war epics. The battle meter has four beats strung together by alliterations, and is compelling in the Old English, but not always well-rendered in Modern English translations.

Charles Kennedy's preface for *Genesis B* in *An Anthology of Old English Poetry* (1960) states that throughout the poem one finds "dramatic versification of material gathered from many sources and blended into what became known as Hexaemeral¹ [hexametrical battle meter] tradition" (115). Interestingly enough, although in John Milton's time (1608-1674) manuscripts of medieval epics were available then and over the following centuries in private collections and within some libraries, scholars rarely studied the possible connections between the medieval manuscripts and the work of those in the 17th century. It is worth noting that scholars such as Stella Revard draw attention to such a connection. In *The War in Heaven: Paradise Lost and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion*, Revard states that "Satan, proud but magnificent, unyieldingly resolute in battle, emerges... wearing the full splendor of the epic trappings. To these poems we owe in large measure the hero Satan as he is developed in *Paradise Lost*. Renaissance poets drew on two traditions to depict Satan or Lucifer: the hexaemeral and the epic" (198).

¹ In this situation, hexaemeral means hexametrical and is not a mere reference to the religious topic.

² Dating puts the MS in the 10th century and thus outside of the range of dates for Caedmon

James Ussher (1581-1656) gave Franciscus Junius F.F. (1591-1677) the MS, which included many sections like *Genesis* and was divided into two books. *Genesis* itself has since been divided into two sub sections *Genesis A* and *Genesis B*, there has been enough research on the manuscripts (MSS) to prove that they were not written by Caedmon.² The first book, containing *Genesis A* and *Genesis B*, was written by a single author.³ It seems on the basis of paleography that the second book was written by three different hands (Krapp, *Junius* xxvi).

Genesis A and *Genesis B* along with book two of the MS are now commonly referred to as the *Junius Manuscript 11* because the 17th century scholar, Fransiscus Junius F.F. (1599-1677) who is known for some of his publications and transcriptions of Cotton MSS, was the last owner before the manuscript was placed securely in the hands of the Bodleian Library.⁴ *Genesis B* is divided into different sections. Richard Wulker in his revision of Christian Grein's *Bibliothek* (1894) broke *Genesis B* into three parts. This thesis is primarily concerned with the first part, called by Wulker "Die Klagen der Gefallnen Engel" and is now generally known as "Satan in Hell" (Clubb x).

A careful examination of "Satan in Hell" from *Genesis B* and the beginning of *Paradise Lost* demonstrates that there is good reason to think that John Milton (1608-1674) was not only aware of the MS *Genesis B*, but that he used it when creating *Paradise Lost*. Many scholars have long debated the sources of Milton's inspiration for *Paradise Lost*. Francesco Cordasco in his work "Junius and Milton"

² Dating puts the MS in the 10th century and thus outside of the range of dates for Caedmon (Krapp, *Junius* x).

³ MS *Junius 11* includes two larger "books". The first book has *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* while the second has *Christ and Satan* and ends with the statement 'Finit Liber II' to note it is the end of the second book (Clubb x; Krapp, *Junius* x).

⁴ My primary source is an electronic form of this MS provided in facsimile via CD-ROM by Bernard Muir (2004).

(1950) states that Milton knew Junius and some of his circle, and yet that there is no hard evidence that Milton ever saw or used in any fashion any part of MS *Junius 11* (250-1). Indeed, Cordasco seems to imply that Junius is more indebted to the work of Milton than Milton to any possession of Junius (250-1).

This thesis will engage with the ongoing discussion of the possible influence of *Genesis B* on *Paradise Lost*. Many scholars have remarked upon the similarity of plot and representation of Lucifer within *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost*. However, most consider it of passing importance since Milton's reading of *Genesis B* was not proven. Both Milton and Junius belonged to a vibrant literary world, sometimes polemic, where literature in the form of pamphlets, books, and letters circulated among scholars. Junius's own publication of his letters in *Letters of Junius* (1772) offers a lively sketch of this "Republic of Letters" wherein scholars not only exchanged manuscripts and books but also circulated copies of letters that they had sent to others and their replies. It is worthwhile, therefore, to consider further the possible connections between Milton and Junius.

This thesis offers my own translation of *Genesis B* in conjunction with a close reading of *Paradise Lost*. This independent translation is a critically important part of this project. There are not many translations of *Genesis B*, and the most recent one is nearly twenty years old.⁵ However, the main reason to do such a project is that there is no better way than by doing one's own translation to pay attention to diction, syntax, and other linguistic features. A close reading of someone else's translation of *Genesis B* will not suffice. While I do consult other translations, I am relying on my own because only then

⁵ The most recent translation, outside of a Master's or Doctorate dissertation that I found was Burton Raffel's translation in *Poems and Prose from the Old English* (1998).

can I offer a greater insight into the connections or lack thereof between *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost*.⁶

Translation theory is fundamental to how one approaches the linguistic evidence Lawrence Venuti (1953-present), states that publishers and readers want a work that gives the appearance “that the translation is not in fact a translation, but the ‘original’,” and this is usually obtained “by adhering to current usage...” (1). Venuti would argue that, on the contrary, the reader should remain aware of the foreign or archaic original and not be seduced by a version that renders the original text, in a sense, invisible (1). The debate, over the merits of a translation that is faithful to the original as opposed to a more modern version that reads well, is an old one. My goal in this translation is not merely to make the original meaning clear, but to highlight the turns of phrase, descriptions, compound words, litotes, and kennings that are specifically Old English. Doing so ought to make it easy to identify any passages in which John Milton may have borrowed from the Old English⁷. My intention is to be true to the original syntax and phrasing — even if that means that it may be more challenging to read for the average modern English speaker.

The tenets of Structuralism, in which the practices of close reading are paramount, are integral to my thesis. Both in my translation and my comparative reading analyses, I

⁶ Works of translation or transcription that I used: Klaeber’s *The Later Genesis and other Old English and Old Saxon Texts Relating to the Fall of Man* (1913), the 16th chapter in the third edition of Cassidy and Ringler’s *Bright’s Old English Grammar & Reader* (1971), the chapter on *Genesis* in George Krapp’s *The Junius Manuscript* (1931). Charles Kennedy’s *An Anthology of Old English Poetry* (1960), Burton Raffel’s translation in *Poems and Prose from the Old English* (1998).

⁷ In Milton’s *History of Britain*, he quotes Bede and other Anglo-Saxon works. Scholars debated the extent of Milton’s knowledge of Old English for decades, and some chastised him for mistakes in translation (Fogle xxxvi). In any case, it was clear that Milton had some working knowledge of Old English and that he sought to incorporate elements of it in his texts.

pay close attention to syntax, turns of phrase, and word choice. Ultimately, I use these practices to build my case regarding Milton's potential familiarity with *Genesis B*. Moreover, I am cognizant of the tenets of Structuralism and the ways in which they may be construed as an important part of "foreignized" translation practices, which I incorporate in my work.

Writing of approaches to authorship in translation practices, André Lefevere (1945-1996), in his work *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig* (1977), cites Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1838) who claims that "there are only two [approaches]. Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible and moves the author toward [the reader]" (74). With translations, two main strategies can be employed. The translator can attempt to bring the work to the reader, and attempt to make the work "pretty" in the new language, or the translator can make the reader go to the work—and this is often called foreignized translation (Venuti 15).

Foreignizing translation deviates "enough from native norms to stage an alien reading experience— choosing to translate a foreign text excluded by literary canons in the receiving culture," and by doing so it not only forces readers to be more active participants in the literature, but stays true to the work in a different way than merely conveying a similar meaning or tone (Venuti 16). In Chapter Two of this thesis, I provide a close line-by-line translation, not to emphasize the true beauty of the work which lies within its native rhythmic sound, but to highlight the Old English elements that were likely adopted by Milton.

It is an easy accident for translators to add their own biases or readings into the translation. A way to attempt to avoid such slippage is to foreignize the translation and to take on as much of the original cultural resonance and usage as possible. A foreignized translation is my goal in Chapter Two.

Translation theory and translation study have only recently, in the past few decades, attempted to rebound from the ideas and guidelines that have held, especially for English speakers, since the early 1900's. It is against such principles as those originally espoused by Herbert Cushing Tolman (b. 1865) and Alexander Fraser Tytler (1747-1813) that translators such as Venuti rebelled against. This translation follows Venuti principles.⁸

In the third chapter, I consider Milton, his works, and elements of *Paradise Lost* that have been compared to *Genesis B*. Mary Nyquist in *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions* (1987), notes that "in spite of the existence of scholarly studies of [the Biblical] Genesis in its various exegetical traditions, the view that the relationship of *Paradise Lost* to [the Biblical] Genesis is basically direct or at least

⁸ Tytler, in his work *Essay on the Principle of Translation*, appears disdainful of translations done during and immediately after the Renaissance and laments that "[i]n poetical translation, the English writers of the 16th, and the greatest part of the 17th century, seem to have had no other care than... to translate language into language, and to have placed their whole merit in presenting a literal and servile transcript of their original" (36). Indeed, Tytler and others like him would have translators "attend only to the sense and spirit of his original, to make himself perfectly master of his author's ideas, and to communicate them in those expressions which he judges to be best suited to convey them" (7). Such opinions lead to slippery slopes and let translators add their own biases and opinions into their works.

Tolman states within *The Art of Translating, with Special Reference to Cauer's Die Kunst des Uebersetzens* (1901) that an attempt at direct translation without conforming to expected English grammar "is so foreign to us that it interferes with our understanding and enjoyment. We are consequently so much the more justified in altering such treatment in translating, since by doing we are only replacing a part of the help which was furnished to the hearer by accentuation and gesture" (34). Perhaps it is from his opposition to this idea that Venuti decided that a translator may, in order to preserve the original sense of the work, as far as possible, foreignize a translation.

unproblematically mediated continues to flourish” (101). Although Nyquist did examine some of the issues of the relationship between the Biblical Genesis and Milton’s work, she focused mostly on the problem of gender and how the portrayal of Eve was different between the two literary works. That there is difference between the Biblical Genesis and Milton’s work does not prove or show the connection between *Paradise Lost* and the part of *MS Junius 11* known as *Genesis B*. However, considering *Genesis B* in context with Milton’s work makes sense. At the very least, examining the historical context of the two works illustrates the fascinating world of manuscript circulation in which both Junius and Milton moved, as well as the interest in Hexaemeral verse that permeated the period.

The goals of this project were to do an independent translation of the section “Satan in Hell” from *Genesis B* and compare it with elements of Milton’s depiction of Satan in *Paradise Lost* in order to join the current debate on Milton’s potential use of elements of the *Genesis* manuscript in creating *Paradise Lost*. My general findings suggest that the debate must continue. In the chapters outlined below, I provide an overview of the circulation of what is now *MS Junius 11* during Milton’s time, an annotated translation of “Satan in Hell,” and a comparison of the two texts that illustrates the suggestive nature of the popular notion that Milton was familiar with the text of *Genesis B* while it was owned by Junius.

The first chapter of this thesis covers Franciscus Junius, his friends and acquaintances, how he came to possess the manuscript that bears his name, and his legacy. Here we see the social proximity of Junius and Milton through the connections that they shared

The second chapter contains a transcription and translation of the sub-section of *Genesis B* sometimes referred to as “Satan in Hell.” Here I demonstrate the foreignized translation technique discussed above and provide footnotes that explicate my translation choices, as well as highlight passages of interest regarding Milton.

The final chapter is concerned with *Paradise Lost*. Not only do I give historical context for the work and why Milton might have been drawn to *Genesis B*, but I also provide a close reading of the first book of *Paradise Lost* in order to compare it to *Genesis B*. I look at general themes and linguistic elements. Based upon my close reading of *Paradise Lost*, in context with my translation and close reading of “Genesis B,” I conclude that while a few segments of Milton’s work bear a resemblance to lines and phrasing in *Genesis B*, there is no proof that Milton used *Genesis B* to create *Paradise Lost*.

Chapter 1: Franciscus Junius F. F. and Manuscript Circulation

The familial and intellectual networks of Franciscus Junius F. F. were far-reaching, and numerous scholars, including Rolf Bremmer (1998), P.H. Breuker (1998), Tiemen De Vries (1916), Peter Lucas (1997, 1998), Sophie Romburgh (2004), E.G. Stanley (1998), and Thijs Weststeijn (2015) have explored Junius's position in society, as well as his importance in the world of manuscript circulation.⁹ The most useful of these sources are Bremmer and Romburgh because both give hard facts with little to no unsupported commentary. Brueker shows confirmation bias.

While the likelihood is great that Junius and Milton were acquainted, and Francesco Cardasco has provided evidence that Junius knew *Paradise Lost*, in this chapter I would like to provide context for the argument that Milton, in creating *Paradise Lost*, could have read and been inspired by what is now known as MS *Junius 11*.¹⁰ Junius received the manuscript from James Ussher and published it in 1655 under the Latin title, *Cædmonis monachi paraphrasis poetica Genesios ac praecipuarum sacrae paginae historiarum, abhinc annos M.LXX. Anglo-Saxonice conscripta, et nunc primum edita*.

From the correspondence between the scholars of the time, it is safe to assume that Junius came into possession of the manuscript sometime between his correspondence with Ussher in July of 1651 and before November of 1652 (Bremmer 208). Junius's publication of the manuscript itself could be seen as proof that John Milton could have known about the poem *Genesis B* even if he was not personally acquainted with Junius, since Milton was in London at the time of the publication. As seen by the circulation of Milton's work among those in Junius's circle, it was common for scholars even in

⁹ The works referenced are those listed in the Bibliography.

¹⁰ Francesco Cordasco in his "Junius and Milton" (1950) notes that "in the miscellaneous letters which have been attributed to Junius, there is ample quotation from Milton" (251).

different countries to keep tabs on one another through reading, comments and critiques by other scholars, and publications of letters (Parker 250, 386-8).¹¹ To better understand the circulation of information, it is important to take a closer look at Franciscus Junius F. F. and his circle.¹²

Franciscus Junius F. F. is also known as Franciscus Junius The Younger and François du Jon. The “F. F.,” which stands for Franciscus filius, was later added by Junius to distinguish himself from his father and from one of his nephews who was also named Franciscus Junius, both of whom were also scholars. The earlier years when Junius did not attach the F. F. are slightly harder to navigate due to the similarity of names, and much of my research was made possible only through the use of a compilation of Franciscus Junius F.F.’s letters and careful scrutiny of dates.¹³ The result of my research is the following survey of Franciscus Junius, F. F.’s friends, relations, intellectual network, and his activities regarding manuscript collection and circulation.

Franciscus Junius, F. F.’s Friends and Relations

In July of 1651, James Ussher wrote to Junius while both were in London concerning a MS of his that he thought Junius would find interesting (Romburgh 802-3). It was not unusual for academics, scholars, and other elite figures to correspond with one another. It is a particularly interesting connection, however, because Milton at least knew

¹¹ Isaac Vossius wrote to his friends about Milton’s published attack on Salmasius while Vossius was in Stockholm (Parker 386-8, 985).

¹² There are many great books out there concerned with Junius and his circle, and a sampling of them are listed in the Bibliography of this thesis.

¹³ I owe much gratitude to Sophie Romburgh for her work in compiling, organizing, and translating a vast amount of Junius F.F.’s correspondences in the book *“For My Worthy Friend Mr. Franciscus Junius”: An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)*.

of Ussher,¹⁴ and because Junius made Ussher's acquaintance through his brother-in-law. Similarly, in 1652, Christoph Arnold (1627-1685), a scholar and poet from Nuremberg, wrote a letter to Junius. Bremmer points out that "Arnold, who also elsewhere expressed his interest in Anglo-Saxon, had heard that Archbishop Ussher had presented Junius with a manuscript which contained 'a rhythmic vernacular poem of the ancient Saxons' ... a clear reference to what we now call the Caedmon Manuscript [MS *Junius 11*]" (208). How did Junius become acquainted with Archbishop Ussher?

Gerard Vossius (1577-1649), Junius F. F.'s brother-in-law, took Franciscus under his wing, and "Junius regularly reported to Vossius about his experiences in London, [and] helped spread Vossius's reputation in England..." (Bremmer 201). The plot thickens when we learn from Bremmer that "amongst Vossius's English correspondents ... we find William Laud, ... Archbishop of Canterbury, and James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh (Ireland), two men who were also involved in the study of the Anglo-Saxon language and history" (Bremmer 201-2). Thus it is partially through Junius's connection to Gerard Vossius that he came into contact with Ussher. Junius' nephew, Isaak Vossius (1618-1689), would also become an important figure concerning the circulation of manuscripts and old books.

Junius and his extended family owned an impressive number of manuscripts and books, and circulated them readily among themselves. The ownership of many of our finest surviving manuscripts can be traced back to Junius and his extended family. Indeed, Junius wrote to his friend William Dugdale (1605-1686) in 1656 to state that "... here in this our hous wee have a most compleat librarie of all manner of printed books

¹⁴ Milton wrote against Ussher in his work "Of Episcopacy against Bp Usher and Bp Hall" (Parker 1058).

and manuscripts... so that, in the opinion of all judicious learned men, my kinsman Vossius is held to have a more exquisite librerie of rare books, and... Manuscripts, than anie other private man in all... [of] Germanie” (Romburgh 874). It was Junius’s connections that kept him busy with manuscripts.

Like-minded scholars have always attracted one another, and the intellectual circles in those days were close, linked by extensive networks of communication. One such example of this networking and communication is seen in the publication of *Apologia contra Johannis Polypragmatici, alias Miltoni Angli, Defensioinem* (1651) and the publication of *Johannis Philippi Angli Defensio prop Populo Anglicano contra* as a response by John Milton and his nephew John Phillips (Ayers 66). It was a common occurrence for scholars and intellectuals to have pamphlets and essays, aimed specifically at other scholars and intellectuals, printed and distributed. Some examples of such literary exchanges include Milton’s “Of Episcopacy against Bp Usher and Bp Hall,” *Defensio Secunda, Colasterion*, and *Tetrachordon* (Parker 1052, 893). Not only did Milton write about other’s works and ideas, but many of those ideas were well received—especially by Isaac Vossius who also disliked Claudius Salmasius (1588-1653) (Parker 985). It appears that Junius knew of, and may have been close with, John Milton according to one letter that Isaac Vossius wrote to his acquaintance Heinsius.¹⁵ This active circulation of letters

¹⁵ James Prendeville’s *Milton’s Paradise Lost: With Copious Notes* (1850) refers to the letter and says that Isaac Vossius described Milton to Heinsius “on the authority of his uncle” as “courteous, affable, and endowed with many virtues” (xxxiii). The letter itself can be found written in Latin in Pieter Burman’s *Sylloge Epistolarum a Viris Illustribus Scriptarum: Tomi Quinque* (1727) in a chapter on Isaac Vossius entitled “Isaaci Vossii” (618). In the letter, Isaac writes “De Miltono jam certior factus sum ab avunculo meo Junio, qui cum eo familiaritatem colit. Is mihi significavit cum Parlamento esse a Secretis in negotiis externis, esse multarum linguarum eritum, non quidem nobili, sed tamen generosa, ut ipsi loquuntur, ortum, stirpe [sic], discipulum Patricii Junii, comem, affabilem, multisque aliis praeditum virtutibus” (Burman 618).

and of other information defines a cultural community often referred to as the Republic of Letters.¹⁶

Junius F.F.'s Intellectual, Artistic, and Social Connections

Although Junius was not English, he spent a large part of his life in England. He went there “in 1621 as librarian to the collector and patron Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel...” (Lucas, “Junius, His Printers” 369). The Earl of Arundel (1585-1646), father to the Charles Howard briefly styled Lord Andover, played a major role in Junius’s life. He did this not only through his patronage, but also through his influence as a collector. The Earl of Arundel had started a collection of classical antiquities before Junius worked for him and continuously added to it (Weststeijn 47-51). In fact, “[f]or Netherlanders who did not go to Italy, the Arundel circle was the place to see ancient art, with the entry to the collection being gained by writing to Junius,” and such was the greatness of the collection that “artists from everywhere ‘flocked’ to London to examine it” (Weststeijn 52). An interesting aspect of this situation is that scholarly Netherlanders of the time (which included what is now Belgium) had to be acquainted with Junius, or know someone who knew Junius, in order to gain access to what was considered one of the largest antique and classical collections of the time.

It is not a great leap to assume that if Milton himself did not visit Thomas Howard’s collection, he at least knew of it. The possible connections between the intellectuals and antiquarians of the time of Milton and Junius grow as one collects more

¹⁶ Carol Pal, in “Forming *familles d’alliance*: Intellectual Kinship in the Republic of Letters,” states that “[i]t has long been recognized that early modern knowledge-making was a collaborative and multifaceted endeavor, sustained and promoted by a scholarly network known as the Republic of Letters” (251). The published works and letters created an international “commonwealth,” where unfortunately, the majority of the work done on this commonwealth “has been published in either French or Dutch” (252).

data. An important topic that this thesis brings to light is that the intellectual, artistic, and antiquarian circles of those of manuscript collectors of the time of Junius and Milton is an intriguing and interesting topic that has not received nearly enough attention.

Junius experienced a keen interest in artifacts, not all of them classical. Junius wrote, “Neither doe wee altogether want such things as may serve to satisfie my private curiosite; for I have mett among that store my kinsman hath with diverse Francike, Anglo-Saxonike, and Gothic Antiquities, no where else to be found...” (Romburgh 874-6). However, “Junius needed his outstanding stipend from the Arundel family in order to pay for the publication of his studies” (Romburgh 877). There were clearly pros and cons to working for the Howards, since Junius could not publish many of his studies during the time that he spent waiting for his stipend to be paid. Despite such frustrations, the Howard connection offered great advantages: “Junius had copied numerous Old English manuscripts from the Cottonian library through John Selden” (Romburgh 877). John Seldon (1584-1654) was someone Junius met through his original connection to the Howards, and “Dugdale had inquired with Junius after the Cotton Genesis lent to the Arundel family” (Romburgh 877). These passages indicate that Robert Cotton was another connection that Junius had in common with the Howards, whether it was made through them or not.

The Cotton family, from Sir Robert Bruce Cotton to Sir John Cotton (c.1570-1702), collected manuscripts and many scholars at the time, such as Junius F. F., were on friendly terms with the family. A cordial relationship is exemplified by the letter that Junius sent to Sir John Cotton around 1670 that stated that Junius had plans to alter, enlarge, and reprint his book *De Pictura Veterum*. In that same letter, Junius states that he

must give Cotton “due thankfulnes ...for the innumerable favours received during the time I was in England unto this present houre” (Romburgh 1046). From the rest of the letter, it is seen that sometimes Isaac Vossius and Robert Scott were used as intermediaries to send manuscripts and/or books between Junius and Cotton (Romburgh 1046-7). Isaac, of course, was Junius’ nephew and Robert Scott had been one of Junius’ printers.

All of this information gives greater insight into the use and circulation of manuscripts in early modern England. The connections between Junius and Isaac as emphasized “[are] an indication that some, or perhaps most books with Junius’ annotations now in UBL characterized or stemming from Isaac’s collection were originally part of Junius’ own collection and were left to Isaac” (Romburgh 881). Romburgh notes that “Patrick Young¹⁷ had also mediated for Junius in connection with a Cottonian Vitruvius manuscript; this is another indication that Junius’ enjoyment of the Cottonian library had not been unrestricted” (881). This comment would indicate that although Cotton did lend his manuscripts, he was picky and at times restricted access to his collection. Luckily for medievalists everywhere, Junius read and made a few copies of some Cotton MSS (Stanley 169). If he had not, many of the manuscripts that were harmed or destroyed in the Cotton Library Fire in 1731 may have survived only in parts, or would have been lost entirely.

Junius’s Languages and Publications

In England at the time of both Milton and Junius, people spoke and wrote in what is considered early or middle modern English. The common language of the elite and

¹⁷ This is the same Patrick Young who had been a mentor and friend of John Milton.

educated in England and across Europe was Latin, and many scholarly books and letters were written in Latin. Robert Lowth¹⁸ (1710-1787) had yet to set down the grammatical rules of English, many which are based on Latin, and English was still mostly considered a language that was “lower” than Romance languages. In the early modern period, learning modern European languages such as French and Italian would have been part of a good humanist education along with some training in Greek and Latin.

Knowledge of the language(s) of the scholars in England at the time helps to explain why many of the letters to and from Junius were written in Latin. The letters in English are the ones that require comment.¹⁹

Junius’ knowledge concerning languages was extensive, and was greater than what was required or expected of scholars at the time. He had reading knowledge, if not speaking ability, in at least eight languages. Not only could Junius communicate in Latin, Hebrew, English, and Dutch, but he “was expert in, or in the course of his studies, became conversant with all the Germanic languages, dead or living, Gothic, the Scandinavian languages, especially Old Icelandic, Old and Middle High German, Old Saxon, Middle Low German, Middle Dutch, Old Frisian, Old and Middle English, Old French” (Stanley 161). This linguistic knowledge rivals that of anyone of his time and would be a difficult task to achieve even in modern times.

¹⁸ Lowth was an Anglican Bishop who in the 1750’s wrote and re-wrote books on grammar that attempted to make English more polite and acceptable than it was previously considered to be. Many of these rules, such as “never end a sentence in a preposition,” still exist today. The irony here is that Lowth based several of these rules on Latin, and Lowth himself had no degree or job that would make him innately qualified to change the direction of the English language, and yet students are still taught many of these grammar “rules” that were set down over two-hundred years ago.

¹⁹ Some of the letters that are in English may have been written with the expectation that the letters would be circulated and/or seen by others.

As stated, Junius collected manuscripts and had a particular interest in those that were Anglo-Saxon. These facts along with Junius' linguistic prowess, made possible his publication of *Cædmonis Monachi Paraphrasis Poetica Genesios ac præcipuarum Sacræ pagine Historiarum, abhinc annos M.LXX. Anglo-Saxonicè conscripta, & nunc primū edita*. This Latin title translates to "Caedamon the monk's poetic paraphrase of Genesis and other Principle Sacred pages of History, about the year 1070 by an Anglo-Saxon written, and now for the first time edited." This means that not only did Junius transcribe the manuscript into a more publishable form, but he also edited it with other scholars in mind. So although the title is in Latin, the body of the book itself is the transcribed Old English of *Genesis*, both "A" and "B."

There cannot be enough emphasis on the fact that, as Lucas notes, Junius's "contribution to the preservation and transmission of Anglo-Saxon texts is an important one. In particular, a number of his transcripts of Old English manuscripts survive, some of which are extremely important for recovering the text of manuscripts subsequently damaged or destroyed by the 1731 Cotton Library fire" ("Franciscus Junius" 369-70). His *Caedmon* was published in 1655. This is of utmost importance because John Milton did not publish the first version of *Paradise Lost* until 1667. This gap in publication dates would have given Milton plenty of time to read, research, or become otherwise acquainted with *Genesis B* before he wrote his epic.

There is some minor disagreement among academics about the year that the "Caedmon" poems, also known as *Genesis A* and *Genesis B*, were published. Although Stanley states *Caedmon* was published in 1655, George Krapp claims, "The manuscript came into the possession of Junius, a Dutch scholar long resident in England, through

Archbishop Ussher, and when in 1654 Junius published at Amsterdam the poems contained in it, he described them as a poetetic paraphrase of Genesis” (*Junius ix*). However, it is known that they were indeed published in both Amsterdam and London. Clearly, there is the chance that Milton came into contact with at least the publication of the Old English of *Genesis B*, if not with the manuscript itself.

One possible concern with the theoretical connection between Milton’s *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* is the argument that perhaps Milton did not know Old English or even, perhaps, know any scholar who did. William Engel argues in “John Milton’s Recourse to Old English: A Case-Study in Renaissance Lexicography” that John Milton knowingly used Old English words and that Milton was fond of “judiciously yoking words from different language origins” for effect and nuance (1-5, 7). French Fogale in his preface to Milton’s *History of Britain* (1971) goes so far as to claim that Milton “did not know Old English” (xxxvii).²⁰ It would be more correct, as this thesis suggests, to side with Engel and propose that even though Milton could read Old English to some extent, “the evidence indicates that he did not spend his time poring over available Anglo-Saxon texts” (6).

Junius, when writing to William Dugdale in 1657 asks after Mr. Somner’s Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, *Dictionarium Saxonico*, which was published in 1659 (Romburgh 879-80). This means that as early as 1659 there was an Anglo-Saxon Dictionary in print and available in London for Milton to utilize if he were so inclined. Another key concern with

²⁰ Fogal’s statement, however, is based on the argument that Milton would not have made so many mistakes in translating Bede if his knowledge of Old English had been better. This does not mean that Milton did not know Old English, but merely that his working knowledge of it was not, as of then, expert level.

the theory of Milton reading the published *Genesis B* is that Milton was blind by that date.²¹

In any case, this overview of Junius's activities in manuscript circulation among men with whom Milton would have been familiar, which may or may not include one of Milton's nephews, provides context for the ongoing debate regarding Milton's knowledge of *Genesis B*.

²¹ Milton was completely blind by 1652 (McColley 300).

Chapter 2: Translation of *Genesis B* with Notes

The goal of this translation is to provide a text that will aid in illustrating Milton's potential use of elements of *Genesis B*. By translating the text myself, I have attained a better understanding of its grammatical and stylistic elements. As noted earlier, this translation falls into the category of "foreignized" translation because it retains the archaic syntax and word choices or sentence flow that may be awkward to modern readers. In the footnotes, I engage with the current scholarly dialogue about this text, as well as indicate elements of interest for discussion in Chapter Three.

For this translation, the numbers of the lines of the poetry are in increments of five, positioned to the left side of the Old English and occur before the line in question. Line 250, for example, is the line that happens right after the number appears on the left. These breaks into stanzas were not in the original manuscript; they have been added for the ease of the reader.

Each page is divided so that approximately a third of the beginning of a page will be filled with the OE. The second third is devoted to the modern English translation. The translation coincides line by line with the OE. Footnotes cover everything from changes or edits on the MS that have been accepted to facts about the syntax. Several of the footnotes concern aspects that will be valuable in the comparison to *Paradise Lost*.

Satan in Hell from *Genesis B*

Hæfde se alwalda²² engelcynna
 þurh handmægen, hālig drihten,
 tēne getrimede, þāem hē getruwode wel
 þæt hīe his giongorscipe fyligan wolden,
 250
 wyrcean his willan, for þon hē him gewit forgeaf
 ond mid his handum gesceōp, hālig drihten.
 Gesett hæfde hē hīe swā gesæliglice, ænne hæfde hē swā swiðne geworhtne,
 swā mihtigne on his mōdgebōhte; hē lēt hine swā micles wealdan,
 hēhstne tō him on heofona rice; hæfde hē hine swā hwītne geworhtne;
 255
 swā wynlic wæs his wæstm on heofonum þæt him cōm from weroda drihtne,
 gelīc wæs hē þām lēohtum steorrum. Lof sceolde hē drihtnes wyrcean,
 dýran sceolde hē his drēamas on heofonum, ond²³ sceolde his drihtne þancian

* * * * *

God had constructed an order of angels
 through strength of hand Holy Lord,
 ten (order of angels) whom He and trusted well
 that they His service would follow,
 250
 work his will; because He to them granted intelligence
 and by His hand created (them), Holy Lord.
 He had made them very happy; one had He so powerful made
 so mighty in his mind; He permitted him so very much to wield
 highest to Him in the kingdom of heaven; had He him so shining made;
 255
 so beautiful was his being that came to him from the Lord of Hosts,
 similar was he to the light of a star. Praise should he the Lord's work,
 glorify should he his joys in heaven and should his Lord thank

²² *Bright's Old English* capitalizes proper nouns that refer to the Lord, such as forms of: *Alwalda*, *Drihtne*, and *God*. To keep true to the original MS, this has not been the case for the OE here. In order to help with clarity regarding pronoun identifications, I will capitalize in Modern English "He" when referring to God; I will do the same with "Lord" to differentiate between the Lord God and Satan acting as lord to his retainers.

²³ There are a few transcriptions of the MS that write *and* instead of *ond*. *Ond* is the older version, and was used in the MS. The use of this word helps to date the MS.

þæs lēanes þe hē him on þām lēohte gescerede: þonne læte hē his hine lange wealdan.

Ac hē a²⁴ wende hit him tō wyrsan þinge, ongan him winn ūp ahebban
260

wið þone hēhstan heofnes waldend²⁵, þe siteð on þām hālgan stōle.
Dēore wæs hē drihtne ūre²⁶; ne mihte him bedyrned weorðan
þæt his engyl ongan ofermōd wesan,
āhōf hine wið his hearran²⁷, sōhte hetespræce,
gylpword ongēan, nolde gode þēowian,

265

cwæð þæt his līc wære lēoht ond scēne,
hwīt ond hīowbeorht. Ne meahte hē æt his hige findan
þæt hē gode wolde geongerdōme,
þēodne þēowian.

* * * * *

for these rewards which He to him in that light bestowed: then He would have let him possess it (rewards) for a long time.²⁸

But he (Lucifer) made it for himself a worse thing, he began warfare to lift-up²⁹
260

against the highest God of heaven, who sits on that holy throne.
Dear was he to our Lord; not might it come to be concealed from Him
that His angel began to be insolent,
(and) lifted up himself against his Master, committed hate-speech³⁰,
vanity word (boast) in opposition (to the Lord), and would not serve God

265

he said that his body was light and shining,
shiny and bright of hue. Not might he within his heart find
that he God would give allegiance,
nor the Lord serve.

²⁴ In the MS there are scribal marks that add the initial *a* to *wenda* and *hebban*. The version in *Bright's* avoids the initial *a*'s and combines *ūp* and *hebban* (301). This change accentuates the compounding of words. It is grammatically correct to pair the auxiliary and infinitive.

²⁵ The edited version of this word in the MS is *wealdend*. The verb *wealdan* means to rule or govern, so it makes sense that *wealdend* would be related and stand for ruler. However, it is easier to differentiate *wealdend* from *wealdan* if the initial spelling within the MS of *walden* is kept.

²⁶ The MS shows an edit that would make this *ūrum*. However, *ūre* is declined in such a way that the *-um* ending would make it dative if the word is acting adjectivally. *Ūre* means ours, and since that is a genitive, the edit of *-um* is rejected. Krapp keeps the edit (*Junius* 10) whereas Cassidy and Ringler do not (301).

²⁷ *Herran* or *Heaven* is another word that some sources such as *Bright's Old English* capitalize. The MS has an edit that adds the *a* after the *e*. Krapp accepts the edit (*Junius* 10) whereas the version in *Bright's* does not (301).

²⁸ I am in debt to Ringler and Cassidy for their translation notes concerning line 258a and b (300).

²⁹ Note "up-lift" as an important compound word to be discussed later in the third chapter.

³⁰ "Hate-speech" is an example of an OE compound word where two words combine and yet keep their individual meaning.

þūhte him sylfum
 þæt hē mægyn ond cræft mǣran hæfde
 270
 þonne se hālgas god habban mihte
 folgestælna. Feala worda gespæc
 se engel ofermōdes: þōhte þurh his ānes cræft
 hū hē him strenglicran stōl geworhte,
 hēahran on heofonum; cwæð þæt hine his hige spēone
 275
 þæt hē west ond norð wyrcean ongunne,
 trymede getimbro; cwæð him twēo þūhte
 þæt hē gode wolde geongra weorðan³¹.
 "Hwæt sceal ic winnan?" cwæð hē. "Nis mē wihtæ þearf
 hearran tō habbanne. Ic mæg mid hondum swā fela
 280
 wundra gewyrcean

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Thought himself
 that he had more strength and might
 270
 than the Holy God might have
 of war-companions³². Many words spoke
 the over-confident angel: thought through his power alone
 how he for himself a stronger throne might make³³
 higher in heaven; he said that his heart urged
 275
 that he west and north should proceed to make
 to construct³⁴ a building; said he (that he) had doubt
 that he the servant of God would become.
 "Why shall I toil?" said he. "Not at all (is it) necessary
 for me a master to have. I can by hand just as many
 280
 wonders work.

³¹ The word was written as *weorð*, but the edit within the MS of *weorðan* is more grammatically correct.

³² "War-companions" are the retainers and those who fight with the lord that they serve.

³³ "Might make" is an example of the OE use of subjunctive. Because the thing had not yet happened, it was not true. We use auxiliary modals now for the same effect.

³⁴ The use of "to make" followed by "to construct" is used in the translation to keep the reduplicate. To reduplicate is the use of the same or a similar word again. This technique was often used to emphasize something, achieve the proper syllable count, make alliterations, or format to the structure expected.

Ic hæbbe geweald micel
 tō gyrwanne gōdlecran stōl,
 hēarran on heofne. Hwȳ sceal ic æfter his hylde ðēowian,
 būgan him swilces geongordōmes? Ic mæg wesan god swā hē.
 Bigstandað mē strange genēatas, þā ne willað mē æt þām strīðe geswīcan,
 285 hæleþas heardmōde. Hīe habbað mē tō hearran gecorene,
 rōfe rincas; mid swilcum mæg man ræd gepencean,
 fōn mid swilcum folcgesteallan. Frȳnd synd hīe mīne georne,
 holde on hyra hygesceaftum. Ic mæg hyra hearra wesan,
 rædan on þīs rīce. Swā mē þæt riht ne þinceð,
 290 þæt ic ōleccan āwiht þurfe
 gode æfter gōde ænegum. Ne wille ic leng his geongra wurþan."
 þā hit se allwalda eall gehȳrde³⁵,

* * * * *

I have much power
 to build a more magnificent throne
 higher in heaven. Why shall I after His grace serve,
 bow down to Him in such servitude?³⁶ I can be God just as He.
 Support me mighty retainers, who will not betray me at that battle
 285 bold heroes. They have chosen me as lord,
 strong warriors; with such might man devise a plan
 execute with such war-companions. Eager are my friends,
 committed in their own minds. I can their master be,³⁷
 govern in this kingdom. So to me it seemed not right,
 290 that I at all have reason to flatter
 God for any good benefit. Not will I long his servant be."
 Then the All-Weilder³⁸ knew it all

³⁵ Interestingly, this word literally means "heard," but stands for "knew." In the time period when Old English was used, things were only true if one could touch them, feel them, or hear them. Keeping this connection in mind, the use of "heard" for "knew" or "know" makes a lot of sense. Satan in Milton's *Paradise Lost* says that he knows of God's creation of mankind- if the prophecies hold true. Satan's statement implies that he knows something because he heard it.

³⁶ Again, Cassidy and Ringler's notes have been very helpful with my translations (301-2).

³⁷ The lack of conjunction is called parataxis and was done on purpose in OE.

³⁸ *Allwalda* literally means "ruler of all" or "all-ruler" whereas *waldend* or *wealdend* means "ruler" or "lord."

þæt his engyl ongan ofermēde micel
 āhebban wið his hearran ond spræc hēalīc word

295

dollice wið drihten sīnne, sceolde hē þā dæd ongyldan,
 worc þæs gewinnes gedælan, ond sceolde his wīte habban,
 ealra morðra mæst. Swā dēð monna gehwīlc
 þe wið his waldend winnan ongyrneð
 mid māne wið þone mæran drihten. þā wearð se mihtiga gebolgen,

300

hēhsta heofones waldend, wearp hine of þan hēan stōle.
 Hete hæfde hē æt his hearran gewunnen, hylde hæfde his ferlorene,
 gram wearð him se gōða on his mōde. For þon hē sceolde grund gesēcean
 heardes hellewītes, þæs þe hē wann wið heofnes waldend.
 Ācwæð hine þā fram his hylde ond hine on helle wearp,

305

on þā dēopan dala, þær hē tō dēofle wearð,
 se fēond mid his gefērum eallum. Fēollon þā ufon of heofnum
 þurhlonge swā þrēo niht ond dagas,
 þā englas of heofnum on helle, ond hēo ealle forsceōp
 drihten tō dēoflum.

* * * * *

that His angel began with much pride
 to rise against his Lord and speak haughty words

295

that were daring against his Lord, He should then those deeds punish
 grief from this struggle obtain, and he should have his torment,
 of all torments greatest. So does each man
 who against his Lord battle wages
 with crime against that glorious Lord. At that time was the Mighty angry,

300

highest heaven's ruler³⁹, hurled him from that high throne.
 Hatred had he won from his Master, His favor had lost [thrown away]
 angry was He(,) the God (,) in His mind. For that⁴⁰ he should seek depth
 (and) fierce hell-torments, those which he won against heaven's Ruler.
 (He) banished him then from His grace and him in Hell cast,

305

into that deep valley where he to a devil changed,
 the fiend with all his companions. Fell down then from heaven
 for a very long time, three nights and days,
 (fell) those angels from heaven into Hell, and the Lord transformed them all
 to devils.

³⁹ "highest heaven's ruler" is a description or epithet for God.

⁴⁰ "For that" is being used much like we currently use "because." "For that [making God angry], he [Satan] should seek the depths of Hell" is a smoother English translation that may help with comprehension for those that are not used to reading foreignized texts or those who are uncomfortable with OE syntax.

For þon hēo his dæd ond word

310

noldon⁴¹ weorðian, for þon hē hēo on wyrse lēoht
under eorðan neoðan⁴², ællmihtig god,
sette sigelēase on þā sweartan helle.
þær hæbbað hēo on æfyn ungemet lange,
ealra fēonda gehwilc, fȳr ednēowe;

315

þonne cymð on ūhtan ēasterne wind,
forst fyrnum cald. Symble fȳr oððe gār,
sum heard geþwing⁴³ habban sceoldon.
Worhte man hit him tō wīte (hyra woruld wæs gehwyrfed),
forman sīðe⁴⁴ fylde helle

320

mid þām andsacum. Hēoldon englas forð
heofonrīces hēhðe, þe ær godes hyldo gelæston.

* * * * *

Because they His deed and word

310

would not honor, therefore He then in (a) worse light
down under earth, almighty God,
set (them) defeated into that black Hell,
there in the evening they have for immensely long,
each of the enemies, fire renewed;

315

then came at dawn the eastern wind,
intensely cold frost; constantly fire or spear (of cold),
some fierce torment should they have.
(The Lord) made man to punish them, their world was altered
(for the) first time Hell filled

320

with that apostate. The angels held henceforth
height of the kingdom of heaven (they) who previously God's allegiance performed.

⁴¹ OE is much like French or Latin regarding negation. Here you can see that the "n" that stands for negation is added on the front of the word that stands for would and thus it means literally "not would," or our "would not."

⁴² *Neoðan* stands for down, or beneath. However, with the use of *under* that stands for under, there was no reason to use beneath. This repetition is used not only for the measure/beat, but also to emphasize how far down Satan and his followers had fallen.

⁴³ This word was written as *gewrinc* in the MS. Krapp suggested *geswinc* (*Junius* 12). Kenneth Sisam in his work *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* finds it more likely that what was meant was *geþwing* while Cassidy and Ringler point out that "the phrase *hard helleo gethuing*, which is very close to [this] halfline, occurs in the OS poem *Heliand* (2145a) and strongly supports the emendation" (Cassidy & Ringler 303).

⁴⁴ The MS initially had *sīð* with the e written above as an edit. The edit within MS *Junius 11* has been accepted and used in this thesis.

Lāgon þā ððre fýnd on þām fýre, þe ær swā feala hæfdon
 gewinnes wið heora waldend. Wīte þoliað,
 hātne heaðowelm helle tōmiddles,

325

brand ond brāde līgas, swilce ēac þā biteran rēcas,
 þrosm ond þýstro, for þon hīe þegnscipe
 godes forgýmdon. Hīe hyra gāl beswāc,
 engles oferhygd, noldon alwaldan
 word weorþian, hæfdon wīte micel,

330

wæron þā befeallene fýre tō botme
 on þā hātan hell þurh hygelēaste
 ond þurh ofermetto⁴⁵, sōhton oþer land,
 þæt wæs leohtes lēas ond wæs līges full—
 fýres fār micel.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Laid then the other fiends in that fire, who previously had so much
 of joy in the company of their Lord. Pain endured
 (through) hot battle surges of flame in the midst of Hell,

325

fire and broad flames, moreover then bitter smoke,
 vapour and darkness, because they the service
 of God neglected. They were seduced by their foolish arrogance,
 angel's pride, not would (they) the Almighty's
 word honor, (so they) had much punishment,

330

they were fallen then to the fire at the bottom
 in that hot Hell through folly
 and through pride, sought other land,
 that was without light and was of full of flame⁴⁶—
 fire's peril great.

⁴⁵ *ofermetto* more accurately translates to “over-pride” instead of “pride,” because it is stressing how great of an over-reach the angels attempted. This is most like the difference between the meaning of pride and hubris.

⁴⁶ The poem seems to be attempting to state that the land was full of flames and of the great peril of fire. However, this translation does not hyperbolize in order to retain the syntax and word order.

Fȳnd ongēaton

335

þæt hīe hæfdon gewrixled wīta unrīm
 þurh heora miclan mōd ond þurh miht godes
 ond þurh ofermēto ealra swīðost.
 þā spræc se ofermōda cyning, þe ær wæs engla scȳnost,
 hwītost on heofne ond his hearran lēof,

340

drihtne dȳre, oð hīe tō dole wurdon,
 þæt him for gālscipe god sylfa⁴⁷ wearð
 mihtig on mōde yrre. Wearp hine on þæt morðer innan,
 niðer on þæt nīobedd, ond sceōp him naman siððan,
 cwæð se hēhsta hātan sceolde

345

Sātan siððan, hēt hine þære sweartan helle
 grundes gȳman, nalles wið god winnan⁴⁸.

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

Fiends knew

335

that they had punishments in requital of a countless number
 through their great spirit and through the might of God
 and through pride most of all.
 Then spoke the over-confident king who previously was most radiant of angels,
 whitest⁴⁹ in heaven and of his Lord loved,

340

to the Lord dear, until they too foolish became,
 that they for evil God (him)self changed,
 mighty in spirit angry, cast them in that punishment inside,
 down in that corpse-bed⁵⁰ and formed for him a name after-wards
 said the highest (he) should be called

345

Satan henceforth, ordered him there (in that) dark Hell,
 grounds to supervise, by no means against God to struggle.

⁴⁷ The use of any form of *selfa* was not very common in OE.

⁴⁸ This was written as *widnan*. The intrusive dental has been removed in most transcriptions of the MS with the inclusion of the extra 'n.' As it stands within the MS, the verb looks more like *windan* which means to twist or fly. *Winnan* makes more sense as the verb choice.

⁴⁹ The contrasts between light/ dark, white/shining, black/dark and besmirched are very important throughout this poem.

⁵⁰ "corpse-bed" is a kenning. A kenning is the use of a figurative expression in place of a noun.

- Sātan maðelode, sorgiende spræc,
 sē ðe helle forð healdan sceolde,
 gīeman þæs grundes. Wæs ær godes engel,
 350 hwīt on heofne⁵¹, oð hine his hyge forspēon
 ond his ofermetto ealra swīðost,
 þæt hē ne wolde wereda drihtnes
 word wurðian. Wēoll him oninnan
 hyge ymb his heortan, hāt wæs him ūtan
 355 wrāðlic wīte. He þā worde cwæð:
 "Is þæs ænga styde ungelīc swīðe
 þām oðrum⁵² þē wē ær cūðon,
 hēan on heofonrīce, þe mē mīn hearra onlāg,
 þeah wē hine for þām alwaldan āgan ne mōston,
 360 rōmigan ūres rīces,
 * * * * *
- Satan made a speech, (a) sorrowing speech,
 he who Hell forthwith should hold,
 take care of this abyss. (Who) was previously God's angel,
 350 white in heaven, until his own heart seduced him,
 and his pride most of all,
 that he would not honor the word
 of the Lord of Hosts. Surged inside him
 (his) spirit around his heart, hot (it) was to him from without
 355 wrath-like punishment. He then with word said:
 "This narrow place is very unlike
 those others which we previously knew
 high in the kingdom of heaven, which to me my Master (had) grant(ed)
 although we, because of the Almighty, might not possess it,
 360 strive after our kingdom,

⁵¹ An editor of the MS marked that *heofne* should be altered to *heofnon* or *heofon*, depending upon how one regards the alteration. *Heofne* is closer to the OS and is a later spelling than *heofon*.

⁵² This verse, "þām oðrum þē wē ær cūðon", is short a syllable and so a few transcriptions and translations have taken creative/artistic license by adding *ham* (such as Krapp does in *Junius* on page 14) or by suggesting a change like *thesero oðrun* instead of *þām oðrum* as exists in *Bright's* third edition (305) and the MS itself.

Næfð hē þēah riht gedōn
 þæt hē ūs hæfð befællad fyre tō botme,
 helle þære hātan, heofonrice benumen;
 hafað hit gemearcod mid moncynne
 tō gesettanne. þæt mē is sorga mæst,
 365 þæt Ādam sceal, þe wæs of eorðan geworht,
 mīnne stronglican stōl behealdan,
 wesan him on wynne, ond wē þis wīte þolien,
 hearm on þisse helle! Wālā, āhte ic mīnra handa geweald
 ond mōste āne tīd ūte weorðan,
 370 wesan āne winterstunde, þonne ic mid þys werode—
 ac licgað mē ymbe īrenbenda,
 rīdeð racentan sāl.

* * * * *

He⁵³ did not have the right to do that
 that He had lowered us into fire at the bottom,
 the hot Hell, kingdom of heaven deprived;
 (the Lord) has it designated with man-kind
 to be settled. That to me is most painful,
 365 that Adam shall, that was of Earth worked,
 mine firm throne behold,
 he will be in delight, and we suffer this punishment,
 affliction in this Hell! Alas, were I able to weild my hands
 and was allowed one time outside to become,
 370 to be one winter-hour, then I with this troop-⁵⁴
 But lay around me iron-bonds,
 oppressive chains collar me.

⁵³ Satan is claiming that God did not have the right to throw the rebellious ones into Hell, and thus they should seek revenge. This is an important idea, especially when it comes to loss of loyalty. Loyalty was very important, but a leader could lose loyalty if he did not act “correctly.” Thus it is important that Satan tells his followers that God acted incorrectly.

⁵⁴ Here Satan trails off because he realizes that he is only day-dreaming. There are times in these poem that Satan starts to rile and rise up in lofty speech only to come crashing down when reality intercedes.

Ic eom rīces lēas;
habbað mē swā hearde helle clommas
fæste befangen. Hēr is fȳr micel,
375 ufan ond neoðone: ic ā ne geseah
lāðran landscipe. Līg ne āswāmað,
hāt ofer helle. Mē habbað hringa gespong,
slīðhearda sāl sīðes āmyrred,
āfyrred mē mīn fēðe; fēt synt gebundene,
380 handa gehæfte. Synt þissa heldora
wegas forworhte, swā ic mid wihte ne mæg
of þissum lioðobendum. Licgað mē ymbe
heardes īrenes hāte geslægene
grindlas grēate.

* * * * *

I am kingdom-less;
such bitter Hell chains⁵⁵ have
seized⁵⁶ me fast. Here is great fire
375 above and below: I have never seen
a more hateful region. Flames do not cease,
heat on top of Hell. Rings⁵⁷ have embraced me,
the cruelly-hard collar (has) obstructed movement,
deprived me of mine ability to move; feet are bound,
380 hands imprisoned. The ways of these hell-doors,
are closed-up: so I by any means may not
from these limb-bonds (escape). Lie around me
bitter irons hotly forged
thick bolts.

⁵⁵ "Hell chains" is a play on "chainmail."

⁵⁶ Here "fast" means closely bound.

⁵⁷ This is a funny play on words by the author of the OE text because rings were often given to loyal followers. The ring giving was so common, in fact, that lords were sometimes called "ring-givers."

Mid þy mē god hafað

385

gehæfted be þām healse, swā ic wāt hē mīnne hige cūðe;
 ond þæt wiste ēac weroda drihten,
 þæt sceolde unc Ādame yfele gewurðan
 ymb þæt heofonrīce, þær ic āhte mīnra handa geweald!
 Ac ðoliaþ wē nū þrēa on helle, þæt syndon þýstro ond hæto,

390

grimme, grundlēase. Hafað ūs god sylfa
 forswāpen on þās sweartan mistas. Swā hē ūs ne mæg ænige synne gestælan,
 þæt wē him on þām lande lāð gefremedon, hē hæfð ūs þēah þæs lēohtes
 bescyrede,
 beworpen on ealra wīta mæste. Ne magon wē þæs wrace gefremman,
 gelēanian him mid lāðes wihte þæt hē ūs hafað þæs lēohtes bescyrede.

395

Hē hæfð nū gemearcod ānne middangeard, þær hē hæfð mon geworhtne
 æfter his onlīcnesse,

* * * * *

Since God has me

385

imprisoned by the neck, therefor I know He knows my mind;
 and that the Lord of Troops also knows
 that we⁵⁸ two would(,) Adam (and I,) badly agree
 about that kingdom of heaven which I ought to control with my hands!
 But suffer we now afflictions in Hell, that are darkness and heat,

390

grimly bottom-less. God himself has us
 driven away into these dark mists. Although He to us may not any one sin accuse
 that we Him in that land did harm, He has us(,) nevertheless(,) of this light deprived,
 cast-out into the greatest of all pain. We may not get vengeance (for that injustice)-
 repay Him with anything of harm (injuries ought)- that He has deprived us of this
 light.

395

He has now created one middle-earth⁵⁹, where he has man created after his likeness,

⁵⁸ A footnote in *Bright's* states clearly that due to the fact that *gewurðan* "is used impersonally with an acc. [accusative] object; unc Adam is literally 'us two'...an elliptical pronominal construction which is common in ON [Old Norse] with both dual and plural but is limited in OE usage to the dual" (306). Although *Genesis B* is most likely a copy from an Old Saxon poem, residual structures from Old Norse are not very common within this work.

⁵⁹ *Middangeard* literally means "middle-earth," but was one of the OE words for Earth as a whole. It is interesting to note the use of *Middangeard* here, though, because it is emphasizing the placement of Earth as in-between Heaven and Hell. It also carries the possible idea that Heaven is like its own world and that Hell is, possibly, a world itself.

midþām⁶⁰ hē wile eft gesettan
 heofona rīce mid hlūttrum sāulum. Wē þæs sculon hycgan georne,
 þæt wē on Ādame, gif wē æfre mægen,
 ond on his eafrum swā some, ondan gebētan,
 400
 onwendan him þær willan sīnes, gif wē hit mægen wihte āþencan.
 Ne gelyfe ic mē nū þæs lēohtes furðor þæs þe hē him þenceð lange nīotan,
 þæs ēades mid his engla cræfte. Ne magon wē þæt on aldre gewinnan,
 þæt wē mihtiges godes mōd onwæcen. Uton oðwendan hit nū monna bearnum,
 þæt heofonrice, nū wē hit habban ne mōton, gedōn þæt hīe his hyldo forlæten,
 405
 þæt hīe þæt onwendon þæt hē mid his worde bebēad. þonne weorð hē him wrāð
 on mōde,
 āhwēt hīe from his hyldo. þonne sculon hīe þās helle sēcan
 ond þās grimman grundas. þonne mōton wē hīe ūs tō giongrum habban,
 fira bearn on þissum fæstum clomme. Onginnað nū ymb þā fyrde þencean!

* * * * *

immediately with them He will again settle
 the kingdom of heaven with pure souls. We should earnestly think about this
 that we against Adam—if we ever may—
 and likewise against his offspring, so at the same time (we) get satisfaction for
 malice,
 400
 divert [change] them (Adam and his offspring) from their will⁶¹—if we may in
 anyway contrive it.
 Nor do I feel sure of that light now for myself anymore, that which He Himself plans
 to enjoy for a long time,
 this happiness with His host of angels. Since we may not ever bring about that we
 mighty God's spirit will soften, let us change it now for the children of men,
 that kingdom of heaven, now that we may not have it, make it that they His favor
 forsake
 405
 that they transgress that which He with His word commands: then God Himself will
 become angry in spirit,
 He will expel them from His favor: then shall they come to this Hell
 and this grim ground; then may we have them as servants,
 sons of men to be enchained⁶² in this stronghold. Let us now think about the
 campaign!

⁶⁰ The compound word *midþām* would translate more literally to “there-upon” or “thereupon.”

⁶¹ Humans are shown here to have free-will that cannot be taken away by the fallen angels.

⁶² Here one gets the idea that Satan wants mankind to be chained much like he has been chained.

Gif ic ænegum þægne þēodenmādmās
 410 geāra forgēafe, þenden wē on þan gōdan rīce
 gesælige sǣton ond hæfdon ūre setla geweald,
 þonne hē mē nā on lēofran tīd lēanum ne meahte
 mīne gife gyldan, gif his gīen wolde
 mīnra þegna hwilc gēþafa wurðan,
 415 þæt hē ūp heonon ūte mihte
 cuman þurh þās clūstro, ond hæfde cræft mid him
 þæt hē mid feðerhoman flēogan meahte,
 windan on wolcne, þær geworht stondað
 Ādam ond Ēue on eorðrīce⁶³
 420 mid welan bewunden, ond wē synd āworpen hider
 on þās deopan dalo!

* * * * * * * * * * * * *

If I had any one being "lord treasure"⁶⁴
 410 formerly given while we in the good kingdom
 sat happy and had control of our seats,
 then he to me might not by better means
 my gift repay, if he furthermore would
 my servant⁶⁵ (be) which gives worthy assent
 415 that he hence outside might
 come through these barriers, and had power with him
 that he might fly with wings,
 fly into the sky, where stands created
 Adam and Eve in the kingdom of earth
 420 surrounded with joy, and we are cast hither
 in this deep dale!

⁶³ An example of the author(s) of the MS using another word for Earth than *Middengeard*.

⁶⁴ Treasure was given to retainers and doled out by lords. This treasure was often times from plunder.

⁶⁵ The word "thane" would also function well here.

Nū hīe drihtne synt
 wurðran micle, ond mōton him þone welan āgan
 þe wē on heofonrīce habban sceoldon,
 rīce mid rihte; is se ræd gescyred
 425
 monna cynne⁶⁶. þæt mē is on mīnum mōde⁶⁷ swā sār,
 on mīnum hyge hrēoweð, þæt hīe heofonrīce
 āgan tō aldre. Gif hit ēower ænig mæge
 gewendan mid wihte þæt hīe word godes
 lāre forlæten, sōna hīe him þē lāðran bēoð.
 430
 Gif hīe brecað his gebodscipe, þonne hē him ābolgen wurðeþ;
 siððan bið him se wela onwended ond wyrð him wite gegarwod,
 sum heard hearmscearu. Hycgað his ealle,
 hū gē hī beswīcen!

* * * * *

Now they (Adam & Eve) to the Lord are
 much dearer and may possess for themselves happiness
 that we in the kingdom of heaven should have
 rule through right; it is the good fortune bestowed upon
 425
 the race of men that to me is in my spirit so grievous,
 my heart it distresses, that they have the kingdom
 forever. If it any one of you may
 bring about by any means that they the word of God
 abandon the teaching, soon after they the more hateful to Him (will be).
 430
 If they break His commandment, then He to them enraged will be;
 Afterwards from them the riches will be taken-away and punishment will be
 prepared (for them)
 some hard affliction. Think of this you all
 how you will betray them!

⁶⁶ *Monna cynne* literally means “man kind” as two separate words. *Cynne* as “kind” was a reference to those being a group.

⁶⁷ There are marks in the MS that show that *mode mīnum* needed to be transposed. Syntactically, the difference is between “my spirit” and “spirit of mine.”

Siððan ic mē sēfte mæg
 restan on þyssum racentum, gif him þæt rīce losað.
 435 Sē þe þæt gelæsteð, him bið lēan gearo
 æfter tō aldre, þæs wē hērinne magon
 on þyssum fyre forð fremena gewinnan⁶⁸.
 Sittan lāte ic hine wið mē sylfne, swā hwā swā⁶⁹ þæt secgan cymeð
 on þās hātan helle, þæt hīe heofoncyniges
 440 unwurðlice wordum ond dædum
 lāre⁷⁰

* * * * *

Afterwards I myself may
 rest in these chains, if that kingdom is lost to them.
 435 He who accomplishes that, for him will be a reward
 ever after of that (portion) of profits we may here-in achieve⁷¹
 in this fire from now on bring about war.
 I shall allow him to sit late with myself, whosoever that comes to say
 in this hot hell that they (Adam and Eve) to the King of heaven
 440 (acted) unworthily in words and deeds
 (by having) abandoned the teachings (of the king of heaven)."

Chapter 3: Milton, His Time, and *Paradise Lost*

⁶⁸ This sentence is an understatement and gives the reading a sense of irony.

⁶⁹ *swā hwā swā* is an OE idiom and a direct translation is not used. The phrase would literally translate to "so who so," and the translation given is closer to the meaning of the idiom.

⁷⁰ It is believed by many scholars that *forlæten*, which means "abandoned", is missing from the text. Cassidy and Ringler are two such scholars (*Bright's* 308).

⁷¹ "profits we may here-in achieve" seems to be litotes, a.k.a. an understatement because it is doubtful that there could be many profits in Hell.

Scholars since the time of David Masson (1822-1907), one of the most well-known biographers of John Milton, have wondered about the possible connections between *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* mostly due to the themes, diction, subject matter, descriptions of Satan, and the ways in which both poems address issues of loyalty and revenge. Masson writes that “there are some striking coincidences between notions and phrases in Satan’s soliloquy in Hell in the Caedmonian *Genesis* and notions and phrases in the description of Satan’s...in the first book of *Paradise Lost*” (557). Unfortunately, Masson does not go on to give what those similarities are.⁷² He is not the only one to leave the readership hanging when it comes to possible connections.

Charles Kennedy, in a similar manner to Masson, states that “It can fairly be said that this section of the *Genesis* [meaning *Genesis B*] constitutes in primitive form an Old English *Paradise Lost*” (*Early English* 163).⁷³ However, he noted “similarities of detail between *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* [sic]...are not necessarily evidence that Milton drew upon the Old English poem” and that is why a deeper look than mere theme must be taken (*Early English* 163). Here I provide a look at three potential connections that Milton had in Junius’s circle, an overview of scholars’ opinions and research concerning Milton’s sources for *Paradise Lost*, a survey of the current debate on if Milton used *Genesis B*, and a close reading of specific areas of *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* in which

⁷² The citation of Masson comes from a footnote on that page, and the rest of the footnote even acknowledges that “[v]ery probably the coincidences imply only strong conception of the same traditional situations by two different minds; but it is just possible that there was more” (557).

⁷³ Kennedy goes on to say that “The really important tie that links *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost* is to be found in the fact that both poems reflect and in some measure form a part of a stream of literary tradition incorporated in the so-called Hexaemeral writings,” a comment that proceeds by a few paltry words his acknowledgement of the fact that Hexaemeral writings are those that have their “origin in commentaries on the Book of Genesis” (163). The Biblical *Genesis* existed before *Genesis B*, and Milton was not the only author in his time to write in the Hexaemeral tradition.

I discuss potential connections between the two texts, but ultimately, I argue that the evidence remains sparse and inconclusive regarding Milton's knowledge of *Genesis B*.

Milton's Potential Connections with Junius

John Milton was born in 1608. He toured Paris, Florence, Naples, Rome, and Geneva from 1638-9, and became completely blind before 1652. Even so, he kept writing, was dismissed from his office as a state secretary 25 April 1660; he published the first edition of *Paradise Lost* in 1667 (McColley 295-300). Numerous biographers have provided overviews of Milton's life. Here, I would like to point out potential connections between Milton and Junius regarding people who may have either known both men or at least knew the work of both men.

Much occurred in England during the life of Milton leading up to the publication of *Paradise Lost*, including a plague.⁷⁴ It was due to the plague that Milton took in his two nephews, Edward and John Phillips. John Phillips may have also known Junius. Regarding *The Life, Correspondence & Collections of Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel*, Mary F.S. Hervey wrote that "Phillips was the nephew of Milton (Evelyn, Diary, I, 265, 493), and with Junius and Taylor, was engaged in the service of the countess, in opposition to her son..."; the countess was Lady Howard (470). It is unclear in the quotation from Mary Hervey which Phillips she was referring to. There is limited information when it comes to the relatives of John Milton. If, however, Hervey was actually referring to a nephew of Milton, it would most likely be to John Phillips.

⁷⁴ Milton lived through several "plagues" if one considers each outburst of the plague a separate one. Parker notes in his extensive biography of Milton how each outbreak fit into the timeline of Milton's life. The plague dates are listed as 1625, 1626, 1630, 1636, and 1666 (Parker 28-9, 34-5, 70-1, 149-50, 598)

The original source from which Hervey, and in turn Breuker, drew was *The History and Antiquities of the Castle and Town of Arundel* by Mark Tierney in 1834. The original transcription of a letter from Lady Howard to Lord Andover, also known as Charles Howard, covers Lord Andover's disdain of a Mr. Phillips and Junius—two men who had been employed by her husband (Tierney 506-7). One reason for Charles Howard to dislike a Phillips, nephew of Milton, would be political. Lord Andover was a Royalist while John Phillips took after his uncle John Milton in their political stances for a free Commonwealth, as seen most readily in the writing of John Phillips.⁷⁵ Edward, however, wrote pieces that support the royalist position.⁷⁶ If indeed a nephew of John Milton had worked with Franciscus Junius F.F., that would be just another example of how small the intellectual and social circles at the time were and it would help support the idea that Milton and Junius knew one another.

Much is left unknown about Milton's nephews outside of their writing. Indeed, it is uncertain when each lived with him, or if they traveled with Milton on his trips. Only the whereabouts of John Milton himself are known with any certainty from the 1630's through the 1660's. Milton traveled to Italy before his nephews came to live with him. The fact that Milton traveled only stands to increase his range of influence and the possibility of who or what influenced him.

While the connection between Milton's nephew and Junius is tenuous at best, I noted two men in Chapter Two who are of more interest in this regard. Among those in

⁷⁵ John Phillips's *Johannis Philippi Angli Defensio prop Populo Anglicano contra* (1652).

⁷⁶ Edward Phillips wrote a continuation to Sir Richard Baker's *A Chronicle of the Kings of England, from the Time of the Romans Government unto the Death of King James*, so that it became that plus *Whereunto is Added, the Reign of King Charles the First... to the Coronation of His Sacred Majesty King Charles the Second*, and this addition occurred c. 1660 and was royalist in tone (Rooke Books; Bonhams).

Junius's circle who clearly helped to circulate Milton's work was Isaac Vossius, who wrote to his friends about Milton's published attack on Salmasius (Parker 386-8, 985). Milton and Salmasius wrote against one another, each on opposite sides of the political controversy of the time- to have a King or not. Salmasius wrote *Eikon Basilike*, and the book made Charles I out to be a martyr (Parker 360). John Milton wrote back the official reply in the form of the book *Eikonklastes* (Parker 360-1). Another person who knew both men was Patrick Young, who had mediated for Junius in connection with a Cottonian Vitruvius manuscript (Romburgh 881). Patrick Young was a friend of John Milton and mentor. In fact, Milton presented a collection of his early prose to Patrick Young (Parker 836). Although the exact date is unknown, sometime in the 1640's John Milton became friends with Patrick Young (Parker 250).

Others in Junius's circle clearly knew Milton's work and may have known Milton himself. These sorts of connections should be explored in greater depth to provide a better picture of Milton's place in the Republic of Letters network that included Junius.

Milton's Sources

Classical

Regarding sources for *Paradise Lost*, numerous scholars have pointed out the similarities between Milton's epic and many that came before it; however, most scholars have focused their attention on the Greek and Roman epics.⁷⁷ Those epics include the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Aeneid*. In his introduction to his edition of *Paradise Lost*,

⁷⁷ S. Humphreys Gurteen has a book called *The Epic of the Fall of Man: A Comparative Study Between Caedmon, Dante, and Milton* that was originally printed in 1923. Gurteen's book, although interesting, does not convince me of anything except of thematic similarities between all three sources. Milton's *Paradise Lost* has even been related to the story of Prometheus, as seen in the work *Lucifer and Prometheus: A Study of Milton's Satan* by R. J. Werblowsky (1952).

Merritt Y. Hughes covers an extensive range of possible classical texts from which Milton most likely drew, including the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, Tasso's *Creation of the World*, and Aeschylus's *Prometheus Bound* (xv-xvi).⁷⁸

Milton, while in Italy and before, was interested in Petrarch. This is seen in Milton's "years of reading in classical and Italian literature," as well as through his use of Petrarchan dialogue that parallels or mimics that of Petrarch's *Secretum* (Cinquemani 65-8). In the later books of *Paradise Lost*, Raphael acts towards Adam much like Petrarch's Augustinus towards his Franciscus (Cinquemani 78). It is even argued by Anthony Cinquemani in his work "Milton Translating Petrarch" that in at least Books V-VIII of *Paradise Lost* Milton "translates the indeterminate conclusion of the *Secretum*" (81).

Old English/Anglo Saxon

In 1934, in *Milton's Use of Du Bartas*, G.C. Taylor claimed that John Milton's work shared so many ideas and similarities as that of Guillaume de Salluste Du Bartus (1544-159) that it was likely that Milton borrowed elements from Du Bartus. However, in the same book Taylor acknowledged that the ideas common to both could be found in Genesis and Old English works and commentaries on that subject (Saurat 216). Grant McColley points out that although a large part of "Milton's themes and details were conventionalities common to poet and theologian alike...[a] number appear somewhat

⁷⁸ Sister Mary Irma Corcoran's dissertation (1945) *Milton's Paradise with Reference to the Hexameral Background* also covers an extensive and in-depth list of possible sources. However, most scholars over-looked or disregarded the possibility that Milton borrowed elements from *Genesis B*.

rare” and some of those rare details are more in line with scenes that come “from Caedmon,” meaning MS *Junius 11* (174).⁷⁹

Contemporary

During the time of Milton, it was popular to write about the fall of man, Hell, Satan, and the creation story found in the Biblical Genesis.⁸⁰ Literature about the six days of God’s work on the creation of the world is considered part of the Hexameral Tradition, with *hexa* meaning six in Greek. Especially in Italy, many authors were interested in these topics and participated in this tradition. Concerning the Hexameral Tradition, several authors wrote similar pieces, some of which are Hugo Grotius’s *Adamus Exul* (1601), Giambattista Andreini’s *L’Adamo* (1613), and Serafino della Salandra’s *Adamo Caduto* (1647). It could be interpreted that such creations were written in imitation of Dante Alighieri’s *Inferno* (1320)—or were merely borrowing from the Gnostic and Enochian texts to elaborate upon the creation story outside of what was explicitly stated within the accepted Christian Bible.⁸¹ Milton’s travels in Italy were influential because it was during that time that he came in contact with many of those works.⁸²

McColley in his work *Paradise Lost: An Account of its Growth and Major Origins, with a Discussion of Milton’s Use of Sources and Literary Patterns* (1940) also contends that his book exists to “make better known the tradition which gave heart and

⁷⁹ McCollen, unfortunately, does not state what he means by “a number appear somewhat rare” and thus a more solid connection to *Genesis B* except for the specific of “Eve gorging the forbidden apple” (174).

⁸⁰ It may be of interest to note that Franciscus Junius the Elder helped create what is now known as the Trimmulus-Junius Bible, which of course includes the book of Genesis.

⁸¹ R. J. Werblowsky states, “What Milton has to say on the subject [of the fall of Satan and then of man] belongs less to [the Biblical] Genesis iv, than to the apocryphal Book of Enoch which repeatedly rehearses the story of the fall of angels, elaborating the bare account of Genesis iv with much fantastic detail, and in particular giving long lists of the names of the fallen angels and of their ministrations to man” (94).

⁸² Milton met and was influenced by Hugo Grotius (Parker 169, 174, 181).

blood to Milton's epic [*Paradise Lost*]" (18). Milton followed in the footsteps of Hugo Grotius's *Adam* as well as John Calvin and Peter Lombard's interpretations of the Bible on the topics of the temptation of man, the weakness of Eve, and the beauty of the serpent (McColley 172-3).

Although it is true that several of the themes found in *Paradise Lost* could also be found in other religious-themed works of the Renaissance, none of them are as true to *Genesis B* as *Paradise Lost*, except maybe Hugo Grotius's work. The similarity between the work of Hugo Grotius and that of Milton may lie in their possibly shared source of *Genesis B*. We know for a fact that Grotius was a friend of Junius F.F. and thus had access to *Genesis B*.⁸³ Grotius's work *Adamus Exul* was concerned with Adam's creation and loss of paradise, much like the later books of *Paradise Lost*. Hughes tells his readers that "If anyone will take the trouble to read Hugo Grotius' *Adamus Exul* and Giambattista Andreini's *L'Adamo* in ...any ...translations of the original Latin and Italian, he will be struck with many things that they have in common with *Paradise Lost* and with each other" (xvii).

Therefore, there is always the possibility that Milton may have known *Adamus Exul* instead of having direct contact with *Genesis B*. The following, however, is an analysis of key elements in *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* that suggests Milton's familiarity with that work. My comparison of "Satan in Hell" and *Paradise Lost*, as well as the Satans in both works, will cover elements from general themes to specific linguistic similarities that exist—as well as offer some possible reasoning behind the similarities.

⁸³ Hugo Grotius was a friend of Franciscus Junius F.F. and was able to view MS *Junius 11* (Bemmer 12-4).

General Themes

Light and Dark:

Throughout the Bible, the book of Matthew contains the most extensive description of Hell. Some key Biblical descriptions of Hell are Matthew 13:38-42; 22:13; 24:51; and 25:51.⁸⁴ Throughout those passages there is much emphasis on darkness and pain in Hell. The book of Matthew is in the New Testament, and as such was officially added to the Bible during the Council of Nicæa (325) during the reign of Constantine I. This means that the descriptions in Matthew could easily have been used for both *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* and thus it would be possible for the two texts to share a source instead of one using the other as a source. Note that the descriptions of Hell in the Bible are limited to being cast out into the dark, burned, and being in pain.

Following this logic, it makes sense that both *Paradise Lost* and *Genesis B* would concentrate on the binary of light/dark as good/evil. The narrator of *Paradise Lost* twice in a short period of time states that the devils are left in "The seat of desolation, voyd of light," as well as a place of "No light, but rather darkness visible" (1.181; 1.63). *Genesis B* seems to put more emphasis than the work of Milton on the fact that Hell is completely without the light of Heaven/God and thus it is a torture. In "Satan in Hell," the narrator states,

⁸⁴ Matthew 13:38-42 "The weeds are those who belong to the evil one, and the one who scattered them is the devil. The harvest is the end of time, and the angels are the ones who bring in the harvest. Weeds are gathered and burned. That's how it will be at the end of time. The Son of Man will send out his angels, and they will gather from his kingdom everyone who does wrong or causes others to sin. Then he will throw them into a flaming furnace, where people will cry and grit their teeth in pain" (CEV).
 Matthew 22:13 "So the king gave orders for that person to be tied hand and foot and to be thrown outside in the dark. That's where people will cry and grit their teeth in pain" (CEV).
 Matthew 24:51 "That servant will then be punished and thrown out with the ones who only pretended to serve their master. There they will cry and grit their teeth in pain" (CEV).
 Matthew 25:30 "You are a worthless servant, and you will be thrown out into the dark where people will cry and grit their teeth in pain" (CEV).

sceolde hē þā dæd ongyldan,/ worc þæs gewinnes gedælan, ond sceolde his
wīte habban,/ ealra morðra mæst. (lms 295-7)

Such a statement insinuates that whatever punishment Satan and his ilk receives is the greatest of all punishments—and thus being without light and God is a great torture.

Loyalty:

In Old English times, members of a *comitatus*⁸⁵ gave fealty to their chieftain or lord.

That loyalty was broken in both *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost* when Satan rebelled against God. As seen in Chapter 2 of this thesis, Satan in *Genesis B* tells his followers that God had no right to throw them into Hell for “Næfð hē þeah riht gedōn/ þæt hē ūs hæfð befællad fyre tō botme”(lms. 360-1). Previous to that, Lucifer had claimed that he could be “god just as He [God]” when he says “Ic mæg wesan god swā hē” (ln. 283).

Milton's Satan has a similar attitude when it comes to loyalty. Satan in *Paradise Lost* says that he has a high disdain for God “from sense of injur'd merit” and that his own followers dislike the reign of God and prefer him for God “Sole reigning holds the Tyranny of Heav'n” (1.98-102,1.124).

However, *Paradise Lost* seems more concerned with the idea of Satan acting as lord and attempting to be his own Lord. It may be that Milton was drawn to this idea of loyalty, false kings, and when one's sworn allegiance no longer should hold sway because there was, at his time, a conflict between Protestants and Catholics and a Civil War was afoot in England. The idea of Satan as a monarch comes up when the narrator claims, “*Satan*, whom now transcendent glory rais'd/ Above his fellows, with Monarchal pride” (2.427-8). Of course, Milton also had his Satan say the now famous lines that it is

⁸⁵ A *comitatus* was a group of men that were attached to a king or chieftain in a military manner.

“Better to reign in Hell, then serve in Heav’n” (1.263). It may have been that Milton had greater political statements in mind when he created *Paradise Lost* than existed in *Genesis B*, but the similarity could exist because of Milton’s interest in the politics that exist in “Satan in Hell” and the possibility of expansion upon that issue.

Revenge:

Concerning the depiction of Satan in MS *Junius 11*, Alain Renoir says, “Satan is, if not the hero in the usual sense of the word, at least the prime mover of the action: the extant text relates the revolt of the angels and the temptation of man” (48). Satan is motivated by revenge. This motivation is seen when Satan laments that humans may take over the fallen angels’ seats in Heaven and urges his followers to find a way to make God angry with the humans so that they, too, will be punished (lms. 421-34). It makes sense that the Satan in the OE would be bent on revenge because “Germanic people of that period considered revenge a binding duty even when the injured party had fully deserved the injury,” and this is exemplified in Satan and his followers’ actions (Renoir 48). There are many times when Satan gives way to his thoughts of revenge. This desire for revenge is also seen in *Paradise Lost* when Satan exclaims,

Peace is despaird,/ For who can think Submission? Warr then, Warr.... (1.660-1)

As well as when Satan tells his followers that

All is not lost—the unconquerable will,/ And study of revenge, immortal hate,/

And courage never to submit or yield. (1.106-8)

The exclamation above is comparable to the OE Satan stating that

Ne magon wē þæs wrace gefremman,/ gelēanian him mid lāðes wihte þæt hē
 ūs hafað þæs lēohtes bescyrede. (lms 393-4)

While the OE Satan outright acknowledges that the devils may not get direct vengeance, Milton's Satan connects his and his followers' revenge to their attack on humans.

Many times in both poems, Satan's mood shifts from high to low and back to high. He gets enraged, and then acknowledges the futility of his thoughts of revenge. Then, however, he continues to entice his followers to seek revenge.

...and we suffer this punishment,/ affliction in this Hell! Alas, were I able to
 weild my hands/ and was allowed one time outside to become,/ to be one winter-
 hour, then I with this troop-⁸⁶/ But lay around me iron-bonds. (367-71)

In *Genesis B*, Satan sorrowfully states how he is bound and without power in lines 389-394, but then he again tells his companions that they must all think of ways to divert Adam and his offspring from the will of the Lord (lms. 396-409). Such fluctuation in mood and topic is a type of rhetoric that is common to the OE Satan and that Milton's Satan uses as well.

We should earnestly think about this/ that we against Adam—if we ever may—/
 and likewise against his offspring, so at the same time (we) get satisfaction for
 malice,/

divert [change] them (Adam and his offspring) from their will⁸⁷—if we may in
 anyway contrive it. (lms, 396-409)

⁸⁶ Here Satan trails off because he realizes that he is only day-dreaming. There are times in these poems that Satan starts to rile and rise up in lofty speech only to come crashing down when reality intercedes.

⁸⁷ Humans are shown here to have free-will that cannot be taken away by the fallen angels.

The theme of revenge, as well as the pattern of Satan's speeches from high to low and the reaction of his followers are also found in *Paradise Lost*. There, the narrator tells the reader how Satan's mood shifted from depressed to once more lifting up his warriors

...but he [Satan] his wonted pride/ Soon recollecting, with high words, that bore/
 Semblance of worth not substance, gently rais'd/ Their fainting courage, and
 dispel'd their fears. (1.528-30)

Not only did Milton's Satan have similar speech patterns as the Satan in *Genesis B*, but there appear to be similar tropes and style choices.

Linguistic Similarities

The inherent oral tradition from which Old English poetry springs includes specific tropes and style choices that we find in both *Genesis B* and *Paradise Lost*. Alain Renoir, a scholar of Old English, states in "The Self-Deception of Temptation: Beothian Psychology in Genesis B" that "[i]n Old English religious poetry the most obvious result of this mutual adaptation [from oral to written tradition] is that the heavenly hierarchies take on an external resemblance to the Germanic comitatus" (51). This is shown when both God and Satan are referred to as *hearra* or "lord."⁸⁸ Milton uses similar phrasing in *Paradise Lost*, even though by his time England was not feudalistic. Milton does not go so far as to call Satan "lord", but he does make it clear that Satan is the leader of the other fallen angels in a manner similar to the leader of the comitatus. Milton lists the hierarchy among the fallen angels, and makes certain that Beezlebub, the second-in-command, refers to Satan as the "Leader of those Armies bright/ Which but th' Omnipotent none could have foyld" (1.271-3).

⁸⁸ For examples, please see line 263 vs. line 285 in *Genesis B*.

Another subtle similarity is the wording of Milton's and the *Genesis B* Satans' taking possession of Hell. Milton's Satan tells Hell to "Receive thy new Possessor" (1.251-2). In the Old English poem, Satan was to supervise Hell,

Sātan siððan, hēt hine þære sweartan helle/ grundes gýman, nalles wið god winnan. (lms. 345-6)

That Satan, much like Milton's who created Pandemonium, made himself ruler and told his followers that whosoever was able to lead Adam and Even to break the commandments of God would be allowed to sit next to Satan and would receive a portion of the reward (lms 439-41).

Conclusion

Burton Raffel and Alexandra Olsen acted as editors and commentators for *Poems and Prose from the Old English* and in it they claim,

Genesis B describes Satan as a Germanic chieftain with his comitatus. Its stirring portrayal of the devil and the temptation of Eve has made generations of readers think of Milton's *Paradise Lost*. The similarity is doubly tantalizing because Milton knew Franciscus Junius, who owned the manuscript during Milton's lifetime. (54-5)

Unfortunately, Raffel and Olsen do not provide documentation for their statement. The notion that the idea is "tantalizing" suggests that they are drawing this conclusion based only on their own observations. Indeed, there are no footnotes, endnotes, nor any form of bibliography. It must be assumed that the two thought this information common

knowledge and thus that they had no need for citation. David Masson, one of the earliest and most cited biographers of John Milton, claims,

Junius, having been a resident in London continuously from 1620 to that year [1651], must almost certainly have been a personal acquaintance of Milton's. Hence it is just possible that Milton had become acquainted with the precious Caedmonian manuscript before he was blind. If he heard of the discovery of such a thing, he was not likely to remain ignorant of its nature or contents. (157)

Masson also did not have proof of the connection between Milton and Junius at the time of his writing; he did, however, write about Patrick Young and his impact on John Milton. As discussed in Chapter 1, Junius was also connected to Patrick Young. Having this friend in common increases the likelihood that Milton and Junius knew each other, and thus that Milton knew of and had access to *Genesis B*.

In *Genesis B* there are “[n]umerous traces of an OS [Old Saxon] original” (Klaeber 51). This makes sense because there are OS Genesis Fragments that were found in the Vatican Library.⁸⁹ Moreover, Eduard Sievers⁹⁰ drew many parallels between the *Heliand* and *Paradise Lost* (Klaeber 49). The importance of these aspects is that it is theoretically possible that Milton drew from the *Heliand* and/or the OS fragments instead of, or alongside, *Genesis B*.

This project does not prove that Milton drew from MS *Junius 11*. However, the evidence presented in this thesis encourages the continuation of the debate. It is my hope that this work may provide future scholars a balanced view of the evidence that informs the debate.

⁸⁹ Karl Zangemeister was the one who discovered the fragments in 1894.

⁹⁰ Sievers was the first person to theorize that *Genesis B* originally came from OS. He was also a very important linguist from the later part of the 1800's to the early part of the 1900's.

Bibliography

- Ayers, Robert. "The John Phillips-John Milton *Angli Responsio*: Editions and Relations." Bibliographical Society of America 56.1 January-March 1962. Mamaroneck: Klaus Periodicals Inc. Print. 66-72.
- Bonhams. "Lot 303* Baker (Richard) Auction 20134: Printed Books and Maps." *Bonhams Auctions*. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Bremmer, Rolf. "Retrieving Junius's Correspondence." *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer. Atlanta: Rodolphi, 1998. Print. 199-235.
- Breuker, P.H. "Junius's Germanic Studies." *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer. Atlanta: Rodolphi, 1998. Print. 125-158.
- Broderick, Herbert. "The Influence of Anglo-Saxon Genesis Iconography on Later English Medieval Manuscript Art". Eds. Paul Szarmach and Joel Rosenthal. *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture: Select Papers from the 1991 Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1997. Print. 211-239.
- Burman, Pieter. *Sylloge Epistolarum a Viris Illustribus Scriptarum: Tomi Quinque*, v.3. Leiden, 1727. *Google Books*. Web. 24 May 2016.
- Cassidy, Frederic and Richard Ringler, Eds. *Bright's Old English Grammar & Reader* 3rd ed. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1971. Print.
- Cinquemani, Anthony. "Milton Translating Petrarch: *Paradise Lost* VIII and the *Secretum*." Carmine Biase, Ed. *Travel and Translation in the Early Modern Period*. Amsterdam: Rodolphi, 2006. Print. 65-88.

Clubb, Merrel. Ed. *Christ and Satan: An Old English Poem*. Hamden: Shoe String Press, 1972. Print.

Cook, Eleanor. "Melos versus Logos, or why Doesn't God Sing: Some Thoughts on Milton's Wisdom." *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*. Eds. Mary Nyquist and Margaret Ferguson. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print. 197-210.

Cordasco, Francesco. "Junius and Milton." *Notes and Queries* 195 (1950): 250-1. *Oxford Journals*. Web. 4 May 2016.

Cramp, Rosemary. "Not Why But How: The Contribution of Archeological Evidence to the Understanding of Anglo-Saxon England." *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture: Select Papers from the 1991 Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*. Eds. Paul Szarmach and Joel Rosenthal. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1997. Print. 271-284.

De Vries, Tiemen. *Holland's Influence on English Language and Literature*. Chicago: Grentzebach, 1916. E-book.

Engel, William. "John Milton's Recourse to Old English: A Case Study in Renaissance Lexicography." *LATCH: A Journal for the Study of the Literary Artifact in Theory, Culture, or History* 1.1: 2008. *JSTOR*. Web. 26 Apr. 2016. 1-29.

Fogle, French. Ed. *Complete Prose Works of John Milton*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1971. Print.

Freeman, James. *Milton and the Martial Muse: Paradise Lost and European Traditions of War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980. Print.

Gurteen, S. Humphreys. *The Epic of the Fall of Man: A Comparative Study Between Caedmon, Dante, and Milton*. Charleston: Nabu Press, 2010. Print.

Hall, J.R. "On the Bibliographic Unity of Bodleian MS Junius 11." *American Notes & Queries* 24.7. Mar/Apr 1986: 104-8. *Ebsco Host*. Web. 4 Apr. 2016.

Hervey, Mary F.S. *The Life, Correspondence, and Collections of Thomas Howard Earl of Arundel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1921. *Google Books*. 7 May 2016.

Hughes, M.Y. Ed. *John Milton: Complete Poems and Major Prose*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2003. Print.

Huisman, Rosemary. "Subjectivity/Orality: How Relevant Are Modern Literary Theories to the Study of Old English Poetry? What Light Can the Study of Old English Poetry Cast on Modern Literary Theory?" Eds. Paul Szarmach and Joel Rosenthal. *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture: Select Papers from the 1991 Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1997. Print. 313-331.

Junius, Franciscus. *Letters of Junius*. London: J. Wheble, 1771. *HathiTrust Digital Library*. Web. 4 May 2016.

Kennedy, Charles. Trans. *An Anthology of Old English Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960. Print.

Kennedy, Charles. *The Earliest English Poetry: A Critical Survey*. London: Oxford University Press, 1943. Print.

Klaeber. Ed. *The Later Genesis and other Old English and Old Saxon Texts Relating to the Fall of Man*. 1913. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International, 1979.

Print.

Krapp, George. Ed. *The Junius Manuscript*. 3rd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931. Print.

Krapp, George. *Modern English: Its Growth and Present Use*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909. Print.

Labriola, Albert. "The Begetting and Exaltation of the Son: The Junius Manuscript and Milton's *Paradise Lost*." *Milton's Legacy*. Eds. Kristin Pruitt & Charles Durham. Selinsgrove: Sesquehanna University Press, 2005. Print. 22-32.

Larson, Laurence. *History of England and the British Commonwealth*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1925. Print.

Lefevere, André. Ed. & Trans. *Translating Literature: The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Amsterdam: Van Gorcum, 1977. Print.

Lever, J.W. "Paradise Lost and the Anglo-Saxon Tradition." *The Review of English Studies* 23, 1947: 99-106. Web. JSTOR. 4 Apr. 2016.

Lewalski, Barbara. "Milton's Idea of Authorship." *Milton in the Age of Fish: Essays on Authorship, Text, and Terrorism*. Eds. Michael Lieb & Albert Labriola. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2006. Print. 53-79.

Lucas, Peter. "Franciscus Junius and the Versification of *Judith*." Eds. Paul Szarmach and Joel Rosenthal. *The Preservation and Transmission of Anglo-Saxon Culture: Select Papers from the 1991 Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1997. Print. 369-404.

- Lucas, Peter. "Junius, His Printers and His Types: An Interim Report." *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer. Atlanta: Rodolphi, 1998. Print. 177-197.
- Masson, David. *The Life of John Milton: Narrated in Connexion with the Political, Ecclesiastical, and Literary History of His Time VI*. New York: MacMillian Company, 1946⁹¹. Print.
- McColley, Grant. *Paradise Lost: An Account of its Growth and Major Origins, with a Discussion of Milton's Use of Sources and Literary Patterns*. Chicago: Packard and Company, 1940. Print.
- Milton, John. *Paradise Lost: A Poem in Ten Books*. British Library, 1667. *Early English Books Online*. Web. 2 Feb. 2016.
- Nyquist, Mary. "Gendered Subjectivity." *Re-membering Milton: Essays on the Texts and Traditions*. Eds. Mary Nyquist and Margaret Ferguson. New York: Methuen, 1987. Print. 99-127.
- Pal, Carol. "Forming *familles d'alliance*: Intellectual Kinship in the Republic of Letters." Julie D. Campbell & Anne R. Larsen, Eds. *Early Modern Women and Transnational Communities of Letters*. U.K: Ashgate, 2009. Print.
- Parker, William Riley. *Milton: A Biographical Commentary*. Ed. Gordon Campbell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996. Print.
- Poole, William. *Milton and the Idea of the Fall*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Print.

⁹¹ This edition was reprinted from Microfilm due to an arrangement with The MacMillian Company. The original book was published in 1880.

- Prendeville, James. *Milton's Paradise Lost: With Copious Notes, Explanatory and Critical*. Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1850. *Google Books*. Web. 24 May 2016.
- Raffel, Burton and Alexandra Olsen. Eds. *Poems and Prose from the Old English*. Trans. Burton Raffel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998. Print.
- Raw, Barbara. "The Construction of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11." *Anglo-Saxon England* 13. Dec. 1984. *Cambridge Journals Online*. Web. 4 Apr. 2016. 187-207.
- Renoir, Alain. "The Self-Deception of Temptation: Beothian Psychology in Genesis B." *Old English Poetry: Fifteen Essays*. Ed. Robert Creed. Providence: Brown University Press, 1967. Print. 35-63.
- Revard, Stella. *The War in Heaven: Paradise Lost and the Tradition of Satan's Rebellion*. London: Cornell University Press, 1980. Print.
- Rhys, Ernest. Ed. *Poetry and Drama: Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. Trans. R. K. Gordon. Great Britain, 1934. Print.
- Romburgh, Sophie. Trans. "For My Worthy Friend Mr. Franciscus Junius": *An Edition of the Correspondence of Francis Junius F.F. (1591-1677)*. Ed. A.J. Vanderjagt. Boston: Brill, 2004. Print.
- Rooke Books. "A Chronicle of the Kings of England." *Rooke Books: Home of the Mad Librarian*. Web. 18 May 2016.
- Saurat, Denis. "Reviewed Work: *Milton's Use of Du Bartas* by G. C. Taylor." *The Review of English Studies* 12.46 Apr. 1936, pp.216-18. Oxford: Oxford University Press. *JSTOR*. Web. 16 May 2016.

Sleeth, Charles R. *Studies in Christ and Satan*. London: University of Toronto Press, 1982. Print.

Stanley, E.G. "The Sources of Junius's Learning as Revealed in the Junius Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library." *Franciscus Junius F.F. and His Circle*. Ed. Rolf H. Bremmer. Atlanta: Rodolphi, 1998. Print. 159-176.

Steadman, John. *Epic and Tragic Structure in Paradise Lost*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976. Print.

Tierney, Mark Aloysius. *The History and Antiquities of the Castle and Town of Arundel: Including the Biography of its Earls, from the Conquest to the Present Time*. London: G. and W. Nicole, 1834. *Google Books*. Web. 5 May 2016.

Timmer, B.J. Ed. *The Later Genesis*. Oxford: The Scrivener Press, 1948. *Google Books*. Web. 6 May 2016.

Tolman, Herbert Cushing. *The Art of Translating, with Special Reference to Cauer's Die Kunst des Uebersetzens*. Boston: B.H. Sanborn & Co., 1901. Print.

Turner, Sharon. *History of the Anglo-Saxons*. 3rd ed. vol. 3. Paris: Baudry's European Library, 1840. Print.

Tytler, Alexander Fraser. *Essay on the Principles of Translation*. London: J.M Dent & Co., 1907. *HathiTrust Digital Library*. Web. 4 May 2016.

Waldock, A.J.A. *Paradise Lost and its Critics*. Cambridge: University Press, 1947. Print.

Warren, Christopher. "John Milton and the International Law." *The European Journal of International Law* 24.2, 2013: 557-81. Oxford University Press. Web. *Ebsco Host*. 2 Apr. 2016.

Werblowsky, R.J. *Lucifer and Prometheus: A Study of Milton's Satan*. London:

Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD, 1952. Print.

Weststeijn, Thijs. *Art and Antiquity in the Netherlands and Britain: The Vernacular*

Arcadia of Franciscus Junius (1591-1677). Boston: Brill, 2015. Print.